



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of the *Iliad* have 58 abstracts, and 24 books of the *Odyssey* have 81, hence the average for both poems is three and a small fraction per book, therefore they cannot belong to the same period because of their great diversity in the use of abstracts."

This is mere playing with figures through taking advantage of the equivocal afforded by the word "book," which in round numbers may mean anything from 300 to 900 lines. The 24 books of the *Odyssey* have 12,110 lines, the 19 books of the *Iliad* have 12,135 lines. The texts being equal, 57:81 is the true ratio of the usage—an increase of 42 per cent in the *Odyssey*. That is the amount of diversity made to vanish by Professor Scott's manipulation.

I declared that my former article should be purely historical, but this has drawn me one step into the merits of the question, and I find myself tempted to take one more.

This process is so closely akin to Professor Scott's method of handling his figures for the entire poem that I will note it, too. He writes, *Classical Philology*, XIV (1919), 144: "However, when we turn to Croiset we find that he gives the number for the *Iliad* as 58, and not the 39 of Causer's, and thus immediately half of the force of the argument is gone. In the article quoted above I showed that even the 58 of Croiset must be raised to 79, and, as but 81 are assigned to the *Odyssey*, the other half of the argument also vanishes."

It does vanish if you permit Professor Scott to make you forget that the *Iliad* is 3,583 lines longer than the *Odyssey*. If you keep that fact in mind, you will figure: 79 words in the 15,693 lines of the *Iliad* means an average of 50.33 words to every 10,000 lines; 81 words in the 12,110 lines of the *Odyssey* means an average of 66.88 words to every 10,000 lines. The diversity which Professor Scott thus dismisses as nothing is an increase of 32 per cent in the *Odyssey*.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

A FINAL NOTE ON CROISSET AND PROFESSOR BOLLING

It is a great satisfaction to me to find that Professor Bolling has been unable to discover any errors in my original statements that these abstracts are found in the *Iliad* seventy-eight times and not thirty-eight, and also that the phrase in question is used only eight times in the *Iliad* and not twenty-five as given by Croiset.

The only fair defense of what Croiset has written would be to show that these statements of his are true, and the only conclusive attack on me would be in showing that what I have written is false, so that I am startled to read that an error in Croiset's figures, untested by me, must be accepted as a vindication for his errors in the poem which I examined.

I simply quoted this error in regard to the *Iliad* to show the groundlessness of the sentence, "It will be, I trust, impossible to argue hereafter that Croiset

was incompetent to compile such statistics," since I assumed that a man who could not quote with accuracy the statistics of another could hardly be expected to compile trustworthy statistics for himself. Now that Professor Bolling calls attention to the fact that his figures are just as bad for the *Odyssey* as they are for the *Iliad*, he must himself feel that in writing that word "impossible" he was using a fairly strong expression. Of course, I am delighted for this added proof of the very thing I wish to establish, namely, that no reliance is to be placed in the statistics given by Croiset.

In arguing from the number 8 for the *Iliad* Professor Bolling is bound to admit that here the word "Iliad" includes Book xxiii, for he cannot find eight examples of this phrase without it, yet his whole defense of Croiset rests on the assumption that when Croiset uses the word "Iliad" that particular book is excluded.

My only answer to such Proteus-like changes of definition has already been given by Socrates, and I cannot improve it. When Crito asked Socrates how he wished to be buried he resented the mental confusion of regarding Socrates' body and Socrates himself as identical things and replied, "Loose definition is not only an error in the thing itself, but it produces also a certain deterioration in the soul."

When teachers and seminaries are busied with finding what a modern writer means by some simple word, when the meaning of "Iliad," "Odyssey," "Antigone," "Herodotus," or the rest must be tested for each particular passage, when we accept 25 and 3 as identical figures with 8 and 1, then our calling is ready for "the dark house and the long sleep."

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

HERODOTUS AND THE FERTILITY OF BABYLONIA

In a familiar passage in Book i. 193, Herodotus describes the great fertility of Babylonia as follows: "Of all the countries that we know there is none which is so fruitful in grain, for it is so productive as to yield commonly two hundred fold, and when the production is the greatest it even reaches three hundred fold. The blade of the wheat-plant and barley-plant is often four fingers in breadth. As for the millet and sesame, I shall not say to what height they grow, though within my own knowledge, for I am not ignorant, that what I have already written concerning the fruitfulness of Babylonia must seem incredible to those who have never visited the country."

What a productivity of a possible three hundred fold means can be grasped by the fact that in our own country the farmer is satisfied with a twenty fold yield of wheat, and I can find no record of any yield of wheat in the United States which has surpassed sixty fold.

Ancient writers seem to agree with Herodotus in assigning almost fabulous productivity to that land; Theophrastus, a skilled botanist and a competent